

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2075

JOHN ANDREWS; SOFIANE BENAFFANE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

UNKNOWN DOC EMPLOYEES (NUMBERS 1-100) AS AGENTS, SERVANTS OR EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES; UNKNOWN MRDCC INMATE; COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF WORCESTER COUNTY; IRA SHOCKLEY, Warden, Worcester County Jail; WORCESTER COUNTY DETENTION CENTER; UNKNOWN WORCESTER COUNTY JAIL EMPLOYEES (NUMBERS 1-100), as agents, servants or employees of the Worcester County Jail; UNKNOWN WORCESTER COUNTY JAIL INMATES (NUMBERS 1-100),

Defendants - Appellees,

and

STATE OF MARYLAND; DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, Division of Correction; WILLIAM W. SONDERVAN, Commissioner, Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (CA-04-396-WDQ)

Submitted: January 28, 2005

Decided: February 25, 2005

Before WILKINSON and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

J. P. Szymkowicz, John T. Szymkowicz, SZYMKOWICZ & SZYMKOWICZ, LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellants. Daniel Karp, Matthew Peter, ALLEN, KARPINSKI, BRYANT & KARP, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

John Andrews and Sofiane Benaffane appeal from the district court's orders dismissing without prejudice their claims against the County Commissioners of Worcester County, Warden Ira Shockley, and various unknown employees and inmates of the Worcester County Jail based on their failure to exhaust available administrative remedies, as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a) (2000), and denying their motion for entry of final judgment as to these claims pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b). We have reviewed the briefs, the joint appendix, and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Andrews v. Maryland, No. CA-04-396-WDQ (D. Md. June 3, 2004; July 22, 2004). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED